

REMARKS

The above amendments to the above-captioned application along with the following remarks are being submitted as a full and complete response to the Office Action dated October 7, 2003 (U.S. Patent Office Paper No. 3). In view of the above amendments and the following remarks, the Examiner is respectfully requested to give due reconsideration to this application, to indicate the allowability of the claims, and to pass this case to issue.

Status of the Claims

As outlined above, claims 1-17 are being amended to correct formal errors and to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject invention.

Additional Amendment

The Title of the Invention is being amended to correct a formal error and to better disclose and describe the features of the present invention as claimed. Applicants hereby submit that no new matter is being introduced into the application through the submission of this response.

Prior Art Rejections

Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, and 8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamashita *et al.*, U.S. Patent No. 6,320,630 (further, the '630 patent) taken with Asada *et al.*, U.S. Patent No. 5,963,287 (further, the '287 patent).

Claim 7 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamashita *et al.*, U.S. Patent No. 6,320,630 (further, the '630 patent) taken with Asada *et al.*, U.S. Patent No. 5,963,287 (further, the '287 patent) as applied to claim 4, and further in view of Chiba *et al.*, U.S. Patent No. 6,380,918 (further, the '918 patent). Regarding claims 10 and 17, the reasons applied to claim 7 were applied to claims 10 and 17 as well.

Claims 9 and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamashita *et al.*, U.S. Patent No. 6,320,630 (further, the '630 patent) taken with Asada *et al.*, U.S. Patent No. 5,963,287 (further, the '287 patent) as applied to claim 1, and further in view of Chiba *et al.*, U.S. Patent 6,380,918 (further, the '918 patent).

Claims 11 to 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamashita *et al.*, U.S. Patent No. 6,320,630 (further, the '630 patent) taken with Asada *et al.*,

U.S. Patent No. 5,963,287 (further, the '287 patent) as applied to claim 1, and further in view of Hamilton *et al.*, U.S. Patent No. 4,503,494 (further, the '494 patent).

Amended claim 1 recites a display device, comprising a display element, plural driving circuits, a display control device which transmits display data and a clock signal to the plural driving circuits, and a circuit board which is provided between the display control device and the plural driving circuits and supplies the display data and the clock signal transmitted from the display control device, to each of the driving circuits via a bus line and a clock line in the circuit board, at least one of the bus line and the clock signal line of the circuit board being formed in a continuous area along a long side direction of the circuit board and being divided into plural lines along the long side direction, and said divided plural lines are connected to the display control device individually.

The Examiner alleged in the Office Action on page 3 that Fig. 1 of the '630 patent anticipates the disclosure of claim 1. Applicants respectfully disagree. In addition to the fact that the '630 patent does not disclose a circuit board, per Examiner's admission in the Office Action, Fig. 1 of the '630 patent discloses single clock lines 131, 132, and data bus lines 133, arranged in parallel with each other. Fig. 1 also features a single date gate driver control line 142. In contrast, claim 1 recites gate signal lines and drain signal lines "being formed in a continuous area along a long side direction of the circuit board and being divided into plural lines along the long side direction". In addition, claim 1 recites that "said divided plural lines are connected to the display control device individually". Applicants respectfully submit that line 142 represented in Fig. 1 of the '630 patent is not divided into plural lines that "are connected to the display control device individually". Based on the differences outlined above, Applicants respectfully submit that the '630 patent does not anticipate the recitation of claim 1.

The Examiner alleged in the office action on page 4 that col. 3, lines 28 through 67 and col. 4, lines 1 to 62 of the '287 patent teaches a display unit with flexible printed circuit board. Applicants respectfully submit that although the '287 patent discloses a circuit board, it does not disclose a circuit board that supplies the display data to "each of the driving circuits via a bus line and a clock line in the circuit board" especially because "at least one of the bus line and the clock signal line of the circuit board are being formed in a continuous area along a long side direction of the circuit board and being divided into plural lines along the long side direction, and said divided plural lines are connected to the display control device individually".

Based on the above and since claim 1, as amended, recites features not taught or suggested in any of the cited references, claim 1 is believed to be allowable over any combination of the '630 patent and '287 patent.

Independent claims 9, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, and 16 have also been amended to recite at least the feature "at least one of the bus line and the clock signal line of the circuit board being formed in a continuous area along a long side direction of the circuit board and being divided into plural lines along the long side direction." As discussed above with reference to claim 1, this feature is not taught, disclosed or suggested in any of the cited references, singly or in combination. Accordingly, independent claims 9, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, and 16 are allowable over any combination of the cited references.

The pending dependent claims 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, and 17 are allowable at least because of their dependency from allowable independent claims, as well as for the features recited therein.

Conclusion

In view of all the above, Applicants respectfully submit that certain clear and distinct differences as discussed exist between the present invention as now claimed and the prior art references upon which the rejections in the Office Action rely. These differences are more than sufficient that the present invention as now claimed would not have been anticipated nor rendered obvious given the prior art. Rather, the present invention as a whole is distinguishable, and thereby allowable over the prior art.

Favorable reconsideration of this application as amended is respectfully solicited. Should there be any outstanding issues requiring discussion that would further the prosecution and allowance of the above-captioned application, the Examiner is invited to

contact the Applicant's undersigned representative at the address and phone number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,

Stanley P. Fisher
Registration Number 24,344

Juan Carlos A. Marquez
Registration Number 34,072

REED SMITH LLP
3110 Fairview Park Drive
Suite 1400
Falls Church, Virginia 22042
(703) 641-4200

December 10, 2003